

Envision Carlsbad Citizens Committee

Minutes

March 28, 2012

**1635 Faraday Avenue, Carlsbad
Room 173**

Committee Present

Primary Members

Eric Larsen (Chair)

Julie Baker

Robert Gates

Mike Howes

Hap L'Heureux

Gina McBride

Diane Proulx

Fred Sandquist

Jeff Segall

Alternate Members

Guy Roney

Tina Schmidt

Absent: Sean Bentley (Primary), Jim Bradley (Alternate), Jack Cumming (Alternate), Jim Comstock (Primary), Kirk Cowles (Primary), Glen Etherington (Alternate), Jim Farley (Co-Chair) (Primary), Barbara Hamilton (Primary), Chris Korogi (Alternate), Greg Nelson (Primary), Robert Nielsen (Alternate), , Sean Sexton (Alternate), Dr. Anne Spacie (Alternate), Jeannie Sprague-Bentley (Primary), Allen Sweet (Primary)

City of Carlsbad Staff

Gary Barberio – Community & Economic Development Director

Don Neu – City Planner

David de Cordova – Principal Planner

Chris DeCerbo – Principal Planner

Jennifer Jesser – Senior Planner

Leticia Treviño – Senior Office Specialist

Consultant

Rajeev Bhatia – Dyett & Bhatia

Committee Chairperson Larsen called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

1. Approve Minutes of the August 10, 2011 meeting

There was a motion and a second to that motion to approve the minutes from the August 10, 2011 meeting. Minutes were approved as submitted.

2. Meeting Process

Committee Chairperson Larsen explained the format of the meeting.

3. Envision Carlsbad Status

Staff gave a brief presentation on the origins of the Envision Carlsbad program, its current status, and where it is headed. Staff reported that public comment and EC3 feedback will be included in a report that will go to Planning Commission.

4. Land Use Concepts Review/Recap

Consultant Rajeev Bhatia gave the Committee a recap of the land use concepts and reported that the community participated by attending the Land Use Concept Workshops and/or filling out a survey which was captured in the Land Use Concepts Feedback Report. When asked how many committee and members of the audience participated, between 70 and 80% of the audience raised their hand.

5. Report on Community Feedback

Consultant gave the committee a presentation on the community feedback.

A committee member asked in general how does a site transition from being commercial to becoming residential. Consultant responded that policies have not yet been written to support any changes. The city is not going to shut down current projects. There can be changes in the future and developers can be given incentives for making changes when there is a need. The intent is not to create non-conformities.

A committee member asked how to define visitor serving commercial. Consultant and staff responded that the difference is hotels are allowed in addition to restaurants and shops. The focus may be more on serving the visitor versus serving the resident.

6. Public Comment

Geoff Reeslund: With Hughes Investments, the original developers and owner/manager of Carlsbad Plaza at El Camino Real and Marron Road. He expressed support for the City's attempts to revitalize and re-energize the city through the new General Plan, supported the waterfront concept that would enhance Carlsbad as a waterfront-oriented city. He stressed that the final outcome should be a hybrid of the three concepts, in particular the Plaza Camino Real corridor and the properties they own. Mr. Reeslund preferred that the existing core of sites remain the same otherwise it would force local residents to move across the freeway to do their shopping. A mixed-use or high density residential designation on their property doesn't make sense. Such a designation change could have potential legal and financial implication with lenders and tenants. He requested that their site's designation remain the same, recognizing Plaza Camino Real is a different entity and Westfield is going to make some major changes.

Shawn Plaxco: A Bressi Ranch resident, he spoke about the potential rezoning of a property that borders Palomar Airport Road, El Fuerte, and Gateway from a business park to a 450 unit apartment complex. He wanted the committee to consider the effect of the change, citing concerns over traffic and impact on schools, parks, streets, and central community.

A committee member asked when there will be a meeting on State of California housing requirements and to explain why this is even on the table in the first place. We have to take housing units and find places for them in the city. It does not seem the general public truly understands we have to find areas in the city to put housing units. The city has to comply with Sacramento. If housing does not go in one area, it will go in another area.

Consultant and staff responded that Paper #2 does go over this. It deals not only with demographic trends that are happening in the nation, state, and locally, but also the city's housing needs from a state standpoint and the projected changes and demographics in Carlsbad. Also, the city's housing needs have compared to the Growth Management Plan and Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The next Housing Element will be part of this General Plan update.

Nancy Ridgway: Lives in Focus Area 1 and is a homeowner in the Madison Area. She asked if the city is looking at changing some of the zoning on some of the properties. There are about six prime properties that the city keeps looking at. There are six homeowners that live near the park that were supposed to have added trees by the Senior Center. She questioned if this is something they do not have to worry about since it is more long-term planning. Nancy also questioned if the city is going to be changing the zoning to mixed use with lofts on top and commercial on bottom.

Staff responded that in the existing adopted Housing Element, there is a program to consider and look at potentially up-zoning certain properties in the Barrio. The existing Housing Element is to potentially re-designate certain properties to higher density. Staff offered to discuss this one on one with her.

Don Christiansen: Thanked the committee on their work. He was confused about proposed open space and wanted to know how much of the 40% is actual natural open space. The city only has one community garden with a four year waiting list. Taxpayers already paying and want space to be put to use. He advocated for there to be at least one community garden in each quadrant.

The consultant responded that the 40% figure includes natural plus the recreational open space together and that a breakdown can be obtained for him. Open space is discussed extensively in the Open Space working paper (WP #3).

TJ Childs: lives on Madison. She stated that the city can be more creative than just putting housing units in places that are traditionally single family homes. She suggested that we get rid of what she calls the "Public Works depot" and use it for senior housing. There are a lot of infill lots located on Jefferson, Harding, and Chestnut and they have high density housing. Maybe the city can buy lots and partner so we can have a balance of single family housing. There is no push to help single family homeowners in Barrio. This plan lacks any incentive for single family homeowners. Ms. Childs stated she lives across from the park Nancy Ridgway mentioned. She hopes zoning does not change, but if it does, she prefers mixed use.

Wendell Barnett: longtime resident and homeowner of manufactured home on Lanikai Lane between Poinsettia and Palomar Airport Road. He wanted to know if the argument to raise density along the coast is to allow for hotels to build up and be more attractive to investors. He had a question on height limitations from Carlsbad and the Coastal Commission and wanted to know if

residential hotel is residential or commercial. Mr. Barnett also questioned if the City will take over the State Park.

Consultant responded that when talking about high density it is relative to Carlsbad's standards and that three to four floors would be the highest. There will not be major change between power plant and state beach, maybe more parkland or a waterfront promenade. There might be some swapping of land but the city would not take over the State Park.

A committee member said that it will be helpful to show on the maps where the coastal zone actually is.

Austin Lynas: from Lanikai Lane Homeowners Association Mobile Home Park. Mr. Lynas said the visitor-serving "coastal button" shown on the concept maps is located on their club house. The consultant explained that the "button" is not a site specific destination but to indicate potential visitor-serving opportunities in that area.

Michele Staples: Xana Way resident in Focus Area 7. Ms. Staples stated that the city's Growth Management Policy allocates residential use compliance and that each concept plan is compliant with Growth Management Policy but not every combination would be. She wanted to know if we are talking about Policy 43, and how would Growth Management policy be amended.

Consultant and staff responded that it just depends on where housing is placed. There is a maximum number of housing units in each of the four quadrants in Carlsbad. We may use up the housing capacity and cannot place additional housing in other areas. The goal is not to change the Growth Management Ordinance in this process, but to comply with it. Proposition E created the caps on housing allowances for the city and quadrants. It was voted by the people of Carlsbad and can only be changed with another vote. Policy 43 is the accounting process to ensure the city does not violate Prop E.

Margie Caruso: Ms. Caruso stated she has a couple hundred more petitions for Bressi Ranch La Costa Greens area in opposition to the apartment complex. She said she understands the housing process and that there has to be affordable housing. This area is already saturated and there is only one elementary school that is overcrowded and underfunded. If that area is rezoned and another developer takes it, the apartment complex can go to 530 and that is a concern. Right now it is a safety issue. Ms. Caruso questioned if a traffic study has been done yet. People have said it is a done deal and a waste of time to try to stop this apartment project from coming in. That area already does have a lot of apartments.

Staff responded that there is no application so the city would not have done any traffic study. After the workshops the city prepared a "Frequently Asked Questions" paper that was mailed and is posted on the website. It answers a lot of the questions that are being asked.

A member of the public asked when would the zoning changes go into effect if the City adopts in 2013.

Staff responded that once City Council adopts the new General Plan, then it would be in place. The only exception, about 37% of the city is in the coastal zone and any changes proposed to land use in the coastal zone also needs to be reviewed and adopted by the California Coastal Commission. This would occur after 2013. The designation on the map would change in 2013 and submitted shortly thereafter to the coastal commission. The city has no control over when the land actually changes use. It is up to the private property owner and when they choose to develop their vacant land or redevelop their existing land. This would happen over time. The last General Plan was adopted in 1994 and we still have vacant land.

Diane Nygaard: Ms. Nygaard said she appreciates the City has done extensive outreach, but despite that, the average man on the street does not know about these 11 focus areas. There is still a need for continuing outreach and education for the public. Open Space is a land use. She said if the comments in the feedback report were to be tallied, the single area of comments rated the highest was on open space, regardless of area concerned. There is a concern about sustainability and there needs to be a balance between more density and open space. Natural open space takes the least services and is lowest cost land use.

Sherry Alvarado: Has property in the Barrio. Ms. Alvarado stated there is a stigma with the Barrio. There should be a vote for people that live in the Barrio whether they want to keep the name "the Barrio" or rename to something like "South Village" or "South Colony." This area is becoming involved with the Carlsbad Village Association.

A member of the audience responded that "barrio" means neighborhood in Spanish and it was predominantly a relocation of the Hispanic community in that area. Right now it is very diverse. A lot of new people have moved in but there are still some of the older people that live there and consider it to be the Barrio. She conceded that there is a stigma because people seem to think "Barrio" has a bad connotation.

Wendell Barnett: Lanikai shares with the Barrio an uncertainty about a future that is closer to the current time than 2035. He said Lanikai has a stigma too because some people say Lanikai is a glorified trailer park. His community is like the Barrio and people tend to be quieter.

Sean Plaxco: Stated he understands that the city has to comply with state requirements and it is fine to build high density residential, but it should spread out more so the impact is not as big. A 450 unit complex is frightening.

Margie Caruso stated she understands an application for the apartment complex has not been submitted but please do not rezone to allow for residential.

John Marshall: lives on Amber lane. Mr. Marshall said he was there to advocate for connection of Poinsettia Lane and wanted to know if the 1995 General Plan lived up to expectations.

Staff responded that Poinsettia Lane is on the Circulation Element today but it is not scheduled by the city to construct it. That will likely happen when the surrounding property and that missing link develops. Alternatively, if traffic in the area approaches the Growth Management Plan performance threshold, then the city would construct the road segment.

Mark Rohrlick: Mr. Rohrlick stated there is a distinction between a General Plan Update and a General Plan Amendment. If a project application came through to the city, it can go ahead of the General Plan Update.

The Committee Chair responded that an applicant can come in and ask for a General Plan Amendment to the old General Plan since the city does not have a moratorium on General Plan Amendments during this process. Such an application would run separate and parallel to this process.

A member of the public wanted to know the status of Chestnut going through to the beach.

Staff responded that the city does not have a project on the books to construct or fund anything. This idea has been repeated by residents on both sides of the railroad tracks that they want another access point to get to the waterfront.

The Committee Chair closed the public comment at 7:34 p.m. and paused for a recess.

7. EC3 discussion and guidance toward a preferred plan

The Committee Chair called the meeting back to order at 7:45 p.m.

Focus Area 1 Northwest Coastal:

A committee member asked how these three concepts address all the core values. These concepts do not discuss arts and education. The Committee Chair responded that all concepts address core values in different ways. It is the job of the committee to see if any of the concepts fail to meet one of the core values. The consultant responded that when EC3 was shaping the concepts, they discussed that land use plan will not do justice to several of the core values, specifically history and culture and services and education that are not entirely land use-driven. Those values will be addressed at a later stage.

A committee member was concerned about the people that did not respond to questions in the survey. He wanted to know how many people actually live in the focus areas they were voting on. The Committee Chair responded that the committee represents the public, including those that did not respond, and there are committee members representing each quadrant.

A committee member said he is a big supporter of the Active Waterfront concept but wanted to know how this concept changes if the Power Plant is built there.

A committee member questioned how appropriate a mixed-use land use at the power plant site will be. He also stated that high density along the freeway in the Barrio is better than a little of mixed-use.

A committee member stated a preference for Concept B (Active Waterfront), but if the Power Plant is moved, then the preference is for more open space on the west side and access to the public rather than residential or commercial. Beach focus is a huge asset to the community and if it is restricted with hotels, commercial, or even residential, the general public is not allowed to use

it. There was Committee consensus on this point. The consultant responded that the pier helps create an active waterfront like the successful communities of Santa Monica or Newport Beach.

A committee member questioned the mixed use on east side of the freeway. She understood that Cannon Road was the freeway entrance to the high occupancy vehicle lanes were going to go. Staff responded that it is no longer in Caltrans' freeway expansion proposal. Also, the 48 acres owned by SDG&E was not part of Prop D, and is currently designated for commercial use.

A committee member stated the property designation should stay as tourist serving commercial and leave out residential or industrial.

A committee member said the map should show the under/over pass connection to the water at Chestnut. Staff responded that this would belong in the Circulation Element as a policy to pursue that goal, or would be shown on the Trails Master Plan. There was a consensus with this.

A committee member wanted to know what the long-term prognosis of the strawberry fields is from an agricultural standpoint. The Committee Chair responded that the price of water and severe labor shortage has caused the operation to shrink this year. They do have a good position to have one of the first strawberries in California, but it is leased land.

A committee member asked if power lines went away and land was unencumbered, what would be appropriate use. Right now it seems like tourist serving commercial is ideal, but it would probably not be the appropriate location for some kind of mixed use.

Committee consensus: Concept B but leave SDG&E site as currently designated for visitor-serving commercial.

Focus Area 2 Plaza Camino Real Commercial Corridor

A committee member said they appreciate input of property owner but wanted to know if it depends on how the zoning ordinance is written. He asked if ordinances can be crafted to allow for the eventual changeover of the land without them being hurled into the short term by lenders. The consultant responded that a site can stay as existing non-conforming use and can continue to invest in it to an extent to keep it going.

The Committee Chair said he does not believe this is a logical place for people to live because of all the traffic by the freeway. A committee member countered that with setbacks and buffers, redevelopment may work. The consultant responded that the maps may be deceptive. Sites may look closer to the freeway than they really are. This can be structured so the most sensitive uses are not right next to the freeway, but this is more of a design and site plan issue.

A committee member said that Plaza Camino Real is finally doing something to update the mall and we should not upset them. If they want to keep this site commercial, we should leave it. A staff member said that the city owns the Plaza Camino Real parking lot. Also, any site designated as commercial there can also be mixed use by right and choice.

A committee member said mixed-use should be optional, let the market decide. A staff member responded that this is how the zoning is now.

Committee consensus: Concept B with open space, mixed use to the west and commercial on the Plaza Camino Real site; east side of El Camino Real to remain commercial.

Focus Area 3: Quarry Creek

Staff informed in the Committee that the existing Housing Element has identified this site for some multi-family housing to accommodate for low and very low income housing needs. McMillan, who is under contract to buy the property, has a master plan filed with the city. Their proposal calls for 660 dwelling units. The McMillan letter says none of concepts are consistent with what they are proposing in their master plan, but B and C are more consistent. They are advocating for a slight difference between B and C to reflect their master plan. A representative from McMillan said they like Concept C the best. The consultant stated that Concept C has less high density and is the closest to the McMillan plan.

A committee member suggested a version that would have the unit yield of Concept C but on a smaller footprint, in order to achieve more open space. It was pointed out this would affect the mix of housing types. After some discussion, the Committee agreed to the consultant's suggestion to revisit a modified version of concept B or C after they provided direction on all the focus areas.

Focus Area 4: Marja Acres

Committee consensus: Concept B/C since they are the same. More density could be added here if there is a need for more housing.

Focus Area 5: Sunny Creek Commercial

A Committee member asked whether an education campus could be located here. Staff responded that the City Council has a goal to pursue a higher education opportunity in the city. A specific site does not need be designated for education, since a school could be permitted in a number of zones now with a conditional use permit.

Committee consensus: Concept A.

Focus Area 6: Mandana

Staff said one of the main owner's letter's regarding a piece of this property is asking for a slightly higher low density residential category to cluster as large lot single families outside of the expanded HMP boundary as can be provided. The number of units would not change. This is more of a design issue. A committee member expressed a desire for a General Plan policy statement regarding grading keeping true to natural land forms.

Committee consensus: Concept A/B/C (i.e., same as existing designation).

Focus Area 7: Palomar Corridor

A committee member said that at every site potential residents will have to drive to go to any commercial services. Staff responded that there is a commercial site in Vista that is relatively close for people to get to.

A committee member said there is a need to find places for more density even though nobody wants it in their neighborhood.

A committee member suggested mixed use can be moved into Concept B at Camino Vida Roble to bring a commercial feel to the neighborhood. The consultant stated that there needs to be a couple thousand people to start generating some kind of demand for services. Spreading housing sites around will not produce sufficient demand for services.

Committee consensus: Concept B modified to redesignate Carlsbad Oaks North Lot 1 and Raceway Lots 12-15 high density residential, and designate properties along Camino Vida Roble to mixed-use as shown in Concept "A".

Focus Area 8: Southern Freeway Corridor

A committee member said it does not make sense to add commercial to the Encina Wastewater Authority (EWA) site because there is not enough residential to support it. The consultant said that the site is big enough to not need high density on the entire site. There may be edges next to the freeway where the density may be more appropriate.

Staff said EWA owns most of the site and that the city owns a small portion of it. Also, the City of Carlsbad is one of the five member agencies EWA. The city has not directly heard from the authority but they are studying the long term uses for that site.

After some discussion of possible uses for the EWA site, the Committee Chair said the committee is short on information since Encina has not been consulted yet. The Committee requested that staff contact EWA about what their vision is for the property.

A committee member asked what would happen to concepts if Palomar Airport Road/Carlsbad Blvd intersection were realigned. Staff responded that the size of the Manzano property would grow. The city is currently in discussions with the state to exchange lands such that Carlsbad ends up with all this land and the State ends up with more campground land.

Committee consensus: Concept A with direction to staff to contact EWA representatives regarding their site.

Focus Area 9: Ponto/Southern Waterfront

Committee consensus: Concept B, with Ponto land uses consistent with the Ponto Vision Plan.

Focus Area 10: Aviara

Park Hyatt Aviara site: the Committee Chair asked what the reality was for this site being residential as in Concept B. It seems that Concept C is more realistic. Staff pointed out that a letter from the property owner supports a change to medium density residential because they believe commercial is not viable. Therefore, the property supports in order, either Concept A or B. After some discussion, the Committee consensus was for low density residential (as shown in Concept B), and requested that staff inform the property owner to give them an opportunity to respond to the Committee.

Poinsettia site: the Committee Chair stated there should be an economic incentive to complete Poinsettia Lane to connect east and west. Staff responded that it is in the City's circulation element to complete the road, but it is not scheduled for construction. Committee consensus: keep the currently allowed density for this site (as shown in Concept A).

Murphy site: Committee consensus was for low density residential and open space as shown in Concept C.

Focus Area 11: South El Camino Real

Committee consensus: La Costa Town Center should be left as currently designated for commercial use (Local Shopping Center). This would allow some mixed use at the owner's option. Keep La Costa Resort parcels as currently designated (Travel/Recreation Commercial). For the commercial sites at Aviara Parkway and El Camino Real, designate commercial as shown in Concept B.

8. Next Steps

The consultant explained the next steps for the committee. EC3 will next meet on April 17th or 19th. Staff will confirm the date and time.

9. Adjourn

The Committee Chairperson adjourned the meeting at 9:58 p.m.